

**Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 1-8 are pending. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as his invention. No new matter is believed to be added by the present amendment.

**Rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-8 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han (US Pat. No. 6421094) in view of Fujimoto (US Pat. No. 5912710)**

Applicant submits that for the reasons discussed below present claims 1-2 and 4-8 are patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Han and Fujimoto.

As discussed in applicant's previous response, applicant submits that Han fails to teach or suggest the limitations

means for generating an **On Screen Display (OSD) signal formatted in accordance with one of the first and second color format**, the generating means comprising  
a color palette that includes color information formatted in accordance with a predetermined color format, and  
a plurality of color conversion matrices for **converting the color information in the color palette to provide the OSD signal, which is formatted in accordance with a selected one of the first and second color format, in response to a selection of the first or second video signal source** (emphasis added)

In the response to arguments, the examiner cites col. 2, lines 11-21 of Han and states that:

*"From the above passages, it is clear that the memory interfacers 3 selected one of the data having different color formats and the format converter 4 converting the selected video data from the memory interfacers into a uniform color format. In order to convert the data having different color formats to the uniform color format, the format converter 4 must know the inputted selected color format. Thus, Han does indeed disclose the claimed OSD generating means that provides OSD signals formatted in a first or second color format as recited in claims 1 and 6."*

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action misapplies the cited portion of Han, and that the cited portion does not teach or suggest the above-emphasized limitations of claim 1.

First, applicant submits that it is erroneous to conclude that Han teaches the claimed OSD generating means based on the fact that format converter 4 converts the received input video data from memory interfacier 3 into a uniform color format, because interfacier 3 and format converter 4 are not associated with the conversion of the OSD signal.

Han teaches that format converter 4 converts the received DTV or NTSC/VGA signals into a uniform color format:

*The format converter 14 receives the DTV or the NTSC/VGA video data through the memory interfacier 13 and converts the input format of the data to the designated output format according to the display and video format output by the host interfacier 112. Specifically, the format converter 14 receives the DTV or NTSC/VGA video data having a YCbCr color format of 4:4:4, 4:2:2, or 4:2:0 and outputs a converted video data having a uniform YCbCr color format of 4:4:4. (col. 4, lines 18-26)*

However, the conversion of the OSD is actually performed in the OSD processor 5 (corresponds to OSD processing part of 15 figs. 2 and 3).

*The OSD processor 15 receives the converted data from the format converter 14 and overlays both the DTV or NTSC/VGA images with the OSD data stored in the memory 12. As shown in FIG. 3, **the data converter 151 outputs the memory access signal to the memory interfacier 13 and reads the OSD data stored in the memory 12. The data converter 151 converts the read OSD data having a YCbCr color format of 4:4:4, 4:2:2, or 4:2:0 into one uniform YCbCr color format of 4:4:4 and outputs the converted data to the MUX 153. The data converter 151 also generates a control signal to the MUX 153 for outputting the OSD data to the OSD location. (col. 4, lines 38-49; emphasis added)***

It is clear based on the above that it is the OSD processor that converts the OSD data read from memory 12 into a uniform format and then overlays the converted OSD data onto the input video data that has been converted by the format converter. Therefore, the conversion of the received input data to a uniform format

by the format converter is not related to the conversion of the OSD signals to a corresponding uniform format by the OSD processor, and the cited teaching of Han regarding the interlacer and the format converter fails to teach or suggest the claimed OSD generator.

Second, the portion of Han cited in the response to arguments does not add anything to the previously discussed teachings of Han and fails to teach or suggest a means for generating OSD that comprises "... conversion matrices for converting the color information in the color palette to provide the OSD signal, which is formatted in accordance with a selected one of the first and second color format, in response a selection of the first or second video signal source" as recited in claim 1. In fact, Han directly teaches away from such a feature.

The OSD processor of Han converts the OSD data stored in the memory into a uniform format and outputs the converted OSD data to a multiplexer for combining the OSD data with the video data. This is actually the reverse of the operation of the OSD generator of the present invention. That is, the present invention provides for converting the color information formatted in accordance with a predetermined color format and converting the color information to provide an OSD signal formatted in accordance with one of a first and second color format, while Han teaches taking color information formatted in one of a plurality of formats and converting the color information into a uniform format for combination with a selected video data that has been converted into the uniform format ("The data converter 151 converts the read OSD data having a YCbCr color of 4:4:4, 4:2:2, or 4:2:0 into one uniform YcbCr color format of 4:4:4 and output the converted data to the MUX 153" col. 4, lines 43-47).

The cited portion of Han, which is directed to memory interlacer 3 and format converter 4, is not inconsistent with the above teachings of Han and does not teach or suggest the above-emphasized limitations of claim 1.

Fujimoto is recited as teaching a RGB color palette circuit that converts pixel data to RGB color data. However, applicant submits that the cited teachings of Fujimoto fail to cure the defect of Han with regard to claim 1 as described above, and as such the combination of Han and Fujimoto still fail to teach or suggest the above-cited features of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1, and the

claims that depend therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over the combination of Han and Fujimoto.

Claim 6 recites the above-discussed features of claim 1 in method form. Applicant submits that claim 6, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over the combination of Han and Fujimoto for at least the same reasons as those discussed above.

**Rejection of claim 3 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han (US Pat. No. 6421094) in view of Fujimoto (US Pat. No. 5912710) and further in view of Susumu Imai (JP 403268594 A)**

Susumu Imai is cited as teaching a conversion matrix for converting R,G,B components into Y,I,Q components. However, such a teaching fails to cure the defect of Han and Fujimoto as applied to claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, Applicant submits that present claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over the combination of Han, Fujimoto and Susumu Imai for at least the same reasons as those discussed above.

Ser. No. 10/030,834

Internal Docket No. RCA 89,633

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Paul P. Kiel  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 40,677

THOMSON Licensing Inc.  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: July 26, 2005

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450 on:

Date

7/26/2005

Linda Tindall

